UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

l	APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
•	10/511,174	10/15/2004	Yoshiyuki Matsumoto	Q84084	1998	
	23373 SUGHRUE MI	7590 01/18/200 ON, PLLC	7	Q84084 EXA HABTE ART UNIT 1624 DELIVE	MINER	
		LVÁNIA AVENUE, N	E, N.W.		CAHSAY	
SUITE 800 WASHINGTON, DC 20037		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER			
				EXAMINER HABTE, KAHSAY ART UNIT PAPER N 1624 TE DELIVERY MODE		
_						
L	SHORTENED STATUTOR	Y PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVER'	Y MODE	
	3 MOI	NTHS	01/18/2007	PAP	ER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		Application No.	Applicant(s)		
		10/511,174	MATSUMOTO ET AL.		
	Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit		
		Kahsay Habte	1624		
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication ap	pears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address		
A SHOWHIC - Externafter - If NO - Failu Any r	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING D asions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. In period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period re to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing and patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be time will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from e, cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).		
Status					
′=	a) This action is FINAL . 2b) ⊠ This action is non-final.				
Disposition of Claims					
5)□ 6)⊠ 7)□ 8)□ Applicati 9)□ 10)□	Claim(s) 1-30 is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraward Claim(s) is/are allowed. Claim(s) 1-30 is/are rejected. Claim(s) is/are objected to. Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or on Papers The specification is objected to by the Examine The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) according a content of the papers and the correct that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct the oath or declaration is objected to by the Examine The o	er. cepted or b) objected to by the Edrawing(s) be held in abeyance. See tion is required if the drawing(s) is objected to by the Edrawing(s)	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). ected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).		
Priority u	nder 35 U.S.C. § 119				
12)⊠ / a)[Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority document 2. Certified copies of the priority document 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority document application from the International Bureasee the attached detailed Office action for a list	ts have been received. ts have been received in Applicationity documents have been receive u (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No ed in this National Stage		
2) Notice 3) Inform	e of References Cited (PTO-892) e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) r No(s)/Mail Date 10/15/2004 & 12/13/2004.	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:	ite		

Application/Control Number: 10/511,174

Art Unit: 1624

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-30 are pending in this application.

Information Disclosure Statement

Applicant's Information Disclosure Statement, filed on 10/15/2004 and
 12/13/2004 has been acknowledged. Please refer to Applicant's copies of the 1449 submitted herewith.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 24-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention:

- a. In claim 24, the pharmaceutical composition lacks a carrier.
- b. Claims 25-30 start as composition claims, but ends up as method claims. Do applicants intend a method claim or a composition claim? If so, the claim should be written in a method of use language. If applicants intend composition claims, then

claims 25-30 duplicate the composition claim 24. Note that claims 24-30 are all drawn to the same composition.

Claim Objections

- 4. Claims 10-16 are objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c) as being in improper form because a multiple dependent claim cannot depend form another multiply dependent claim. For example, claim 10 depends from claims 7-9 that are multiply dependent claims.
- 5. Claims 23-25 are objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c) as being in improper form because a multiple dependent claim cannot depend form another multiply dependent claim. For example, claim 23 depends from claims 21-22 that are multiply dependent claims.

Double Patenting

6. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated

Application/Control Number: 10/511,174

Art Unit: 1624

by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

7. Claims 1-30 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-30 of copending Application No. 10/512,339. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because there is significant overlap between claims 1-30 of the instant application and claims 1-30 of copending Application No. 10/512,339. Both applications are directed to almost the same invention. The only difference between formula (I) of the instant claim 1 and formula (I) of copending

Application/Control Number: 10/511,174

Art Unit: 1624

Application No. 10/512,339 is that the piperidine derivative. The piperidine derivative of the formula (I) of the copending application 10/512,339 is substituted by fluoro at 4-position, but the piperidine derivative in the instant application is not substituted by fluoro at that position. Halogens such as fluoro are the most common substituents. It does not require a complex organic technique to substitute a fluoro substituent in any organic compound that permits a substituent. Thus, it is obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention was made to add/remove a fluoro substituent, since fluoro is a common substituent in organic chemistry.

This is a <u>provisional</u> obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Conclusion

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kahsay Habte whose telephone number is (571)-272-0667. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (9.00-5:30).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, James O. Wilson can be reached at (571) 272-0661. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571)-273-8300.

Application/Control Number: 10/511,174 Page 6

Art Unit: 1624

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Kahsay Habte Primary Examiner

Art Unit 1624

KΗ

January 9, 2007